

to this court, and is, consequently, now depending on the equity side of Baltimore County Court.

And, the application, therefore, to this court now is, that trustees, appointed by a decree of Baltimore County Court, to make sale of property in a case which is still there, shall bring into this court the proceeds of such sale to await the decree which may be passed by the court in this cause.

It is, I think, very clear, that this cannot be done—the case of *Brown vs. Wallace*, 4 *Gill and Johns.*, 469, is directly opposed to it. The remedy of the plaintiffs (if they have any) would seem to be by a proceeding in the court under whose authority the sale was made, and, perhaps, by a petition in the same cause. It is very certain, however, that this court cannot order a trustee, acting under the decree of a court of concurrent jurisdiction, to do any thing. If such an authority were exercised by the co-ordinate equity tribunals of our state, the utmost confusion and clashing of power would ensue.

[The Chancellor then ordered, that the “bill and the amended bill of complaint” be dismissed with costs.]

[No appeal was taken from this decree.]

SAMUEL W. THOMAS vs. WOOD, EX'R OF HARRISON. <hr/> WOOD, EX'R OF HARRISON, vs. SAMUEL W. THOMAS ET AL. (CONSOLIDATED.)	}	SEPTEMBER TERM, 1848.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-----------------------

[CONVERSION—FAILURE OF DEVISE TO WIDOW—MANUMISSION—ADMINISTRATION DE BONIS NON.]

LANDS devised to be sold are turned into money, and considered, in equity, as personal estate.

A testator devised his lands to his executors to be sold, and gave a legacy of \$2000 to his niece, to be paid her out of the proceeds of the sale of his real estate. **HELD—**